

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

JAMES BROWN, JR., #02230809	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:19cv609
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Petitioner James Brown, Jr., a prisoner confined within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petition was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

On January 26, 2023, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that Petitioner's habeas petition be dismissed, without prejudice, for the failure to exhaust state court remedies. She further recommended that Petitioner be denied a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*. Docket No. 18. A copy of this Report was sent to Petitioner at his last-known address. To date, however, Petitioner neither filed objections nor communicated with the Court.

The Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other*

*grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten days to fourteen days).


Here, Petitioner has not filed objections. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews her legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.>").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 18) as the findings of this Court. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that Petitioner's habeas petition is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, for the failure to exhaust state court remedies. Petitioner is further **DENIED** a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*. Finally, it is

**ORDERED** that any and all motions which may be pending in this civil action are hereby **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **6th** day of **March, 2023**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE